

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/657,701	09/08/2000	Xin Ou	62164/JPW/PJP 2853	
7590 02/13/2006			EXAMINER	
John P White			LACYK, JOHN P	
Cooper & Dun	ham LLP			
1185 Avenue of the Americas			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
New York, NY 10036			3735	-1

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/657,701	OU ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	John P. Lacyk	3735
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on  2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.	action is non-final.  nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 31-34 is/are withdraw 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	n from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11).	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 08/15/03.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 09/657,701 Page 2

Art Unit: 3735

1. Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1-30 in the reply filed on 11/18/05 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

- Claims 31-34 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR
   1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 11/18/05.
- 3. The information disclosure statement filed 08/15/03 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered. Copies of references E,P,R,S,W,Z and AA are not provided, further reference T appears to be particularly relevant however there is no date associated with this reference. As such these listed references have not been considered at this time.
- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 09/657,701 Page 3

Art Unit: 3735

5. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis et al (WO 99/17812) in view of Zamora et al (Radiolabeling Brachytherapy Sources with Re-188 Through Chelating Microfilms: Stents).

Lewis et al discloses a radioactive device that is implanted in the body to provide therapy. The device includes making the device that has a substrate material or wire that has a radiation source the can be adsorbed onto the wire and a biocompatible material to seal radioactive source (page 2, line 17- page 3, line 11). The radioactive source can be attached to the device in many known ways including adsorption, pages 10-13 teach that adsorption requires the wire to be preconditioned to provide a film or layer using organic agents including phosphoric acid. Lewis et al teaches the claimed device except for the use of a chelating or polymer layer on the substrate material. Zamora et al teaches that it is well known to use such a layer and teaches (page 246; Results) that wafers with the chelating layer had a much better bounding with the radioactive elements than wafers without the layer. Therefore a modification of Lewis et al to include such a layer would have been obvious since this would allow a more effective bonding with the radioactive isotope.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Coniglione is cited to further show the state of the art.

Art Unit: 3735

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John P. Lacyk whose telephone number is 571-272-4728. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ali Imam can be reached on 571-272-4737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

John P Lacyk
Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3735